



March 15, 2006

VIA ECFS

Marlene M. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Ex Parte: WC Docket 05-261, WC Docket No. 04-313 and CC Docket No. 01-338

Dear Ms. Dortch:

This letter is provided in response to the March 10, 2006 letter filed by Jim Lamoureux on behalf of AT&T wherein Mr. Lamoureux again attempts to defend the woefully deficient processes that AT&T has in place in order to convert large numbers of UNE-P lines to UNE-L, and once again attempts to point the finger of blame at Fones4All for any problems with the transition process. The fact of the matter is that AT&T's existing batch hot cut process, which fails to provide Fones4All with the ability to expeditiously and seamlessly transition their UNE-P customers to alternate facilities, has serious limitations that have already significantly delayed Fones4All's transition and which in the end will end up costing the company tens if not hundreds of thousands of dollars. In fact, since Fones4All first began submitting batch conversion orders in mid February, only a handful of conversions have been successfully completed and as of March 11 the remainder of the lines have been repriced at resale prices.

Under AT&T's "Bulk Batch Request" process, Fones4All must schedule each batch order no fewer than **five business days in advance of the date** when Fones4All wishes the conversion to take place. Once the batch reservation is made Fones4All must write the LSRs for each line to be converted, even though the order is really actually nothing more than a "migrate as- is" order. On the date the conversion is to take place, if even one piece of information relating to a single LSR is entered incorrectly, the entire batch order is rejected by AT&T. However, due to the significant limitations on AT&T's systems, there is no automated way for AT&T to notify the Fones4All provisioner who actually placed the order that order has been rejected. Instead, once they become aware of the rejection, AT&T personnel must place a phone call to a single point of contact at the CLEC, who must then notify the provisioner. This introduces additional significant delay, and indeed, with Fones4All's initial test orders no word that the orders had been rejected was received for several days. Once notification of rejection of the order has been

received, the carrier must resubmit the batch order reservation and the five business day clock starts over anew.

In addition to the limitations inherent in the batch ordering process, AT&T has been unable to provide Fones4All with access to AT&T's Provisioning Website (PWS)¹ which has severely hampered the ordering process. If Fones4All has proper access to PWS it could actually see the status of its orders and know whether an order had been completed, or otherwise view its status. However access to PWS has not been available to date and AT&T's failure to provide access to the PWS has significantly hampered Fones4All's ability to view its orders and therefore conduct troubleshooting, which has contributed to additional delay in the transition process, again at a significant cost to Fones4All.

It is unclear why there are such severe limitations on AT&T's ability to complete the transition in a more expeditious fashion, especially in light of Mr. Lamoureux's explanation of the rationale for AT&T California's "Motion to Compel." Mr. Lamoureux explained that by February AT&T had allegedly already converted "over million of the UNE-P lines [in California] to an alternate arrangement" when it filed the Motion to Compel in mid February. What Mr. Lamoureux fails to note, however, is that almost none of those lines were converted using AT&T's tedious and terribly inefficient Bulk Batch Request process which Fones4All is now diligently attempting to navigate. In fact, Fones4All understands that is the only carrier to use the process to conduct its transition. Given the serious limitations of the process, it is no wonder that most carriers avoided using it at all costs. Moreover, with the mergers of AT&T and MCI, along with the fact that most CLECs were eventually required by operational necessity to enter into a "commercial arrangement" with AT&T its not clear where in AT&T's systems the bottleneck is arising.

While AT&T's operations personnel are seemingly doing their best to work with Fones4All, the fact remains that they are severely constrained in their ability to be helpful by AT&T's woefully inefficient and labor intensive processes and systems. At the current glacial rate of conversion, it will take Fones4All at least several more months and cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to complete its UNE-P transition, largely as a result of AT&T's initial delays in working with Fones4All and its seriously limited batch cut capabilities. Indeed, the serious limitations on AT&T's systems raise questions regarding whether AT&T California remains in compliance with its Section 271 obligations to provide nondiscriminatory access to OSS. Based on Fones4All's experiences in attempting to convert its UNE-P lines, the performance of AT&T to dates strongly suggests that there are serious questions about AT&T's on-going compliance with these statutory obligations.

¹ "SBC's Provisioning Website (PWS) is a CLEC-specific web-based reporting tool that is available through CLEC Online. PWS allows users to view the status of their hot cut orders. SBC is making available an enhancement to support the hot cut provisioning process that will provide CLECs with the ability to view the real time results of the Dial Tone/Automatic Number Identification (DT/ANI) testing (for both CHC and FDT orders) performed on Due Date minus two (DD-2). This will benefit CLECs in that they will have all hot cut related provisioning status in one tool."

Sincerely,

Ross A. Buntrock/gut

Ross A. Buntrock